

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

LARRY GENE HEGGEM, ) CASE NO. C07-1012-MJP-MAT  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. ) ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S PENDING  
) MOTIONS AND REQUESTS  
ANDREA MATHERN, )  
)  
Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

This is a civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Currently pending before the Court are plaintiff's motions for an extension of the discovery and dispositive motion filing deadlines previously established by the Court and for leave to serve an additional 25 interrogatories. Also pending before the Court are plaintiff's requests for copies and for defendant to schedule a telephonic conference. The Court, having reviewed plaintiff's pending motions and requests, does hereby find and ORDER as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's motions for an extension of the discovery and dispositive motion deadlines and for leave to serve an additional 25 interrogatories (Dkt. Nos. 46 and 64) are GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

01 Plaintiff seeks a three month extension of the discovery and dispositive motion filing  
02 deadlines in this case. In support of this request, plaintiff cites to difficulties associated with  
03 litigating this case *pro se* and to the fact that he is currently housed in segregation and has limited  
04 access to law books. Defendant does not oppose plaintiff's request for an extension of time. The  
05 Court is satisfied that the requested extension is appropriate. Accordingly, the discovery deadline  
06 is extended to **October 6, 2008**. The dispositive motion filing deadline is extended to **November**  
07 **6, 2008**. The joint pretrial statement deadline is STRICKEN and will be re-set, if necessary, at  
08 a later date.

09 Plaintiff also seeks leave to serve an additional 25 interrogatories on defendant. Defendant  
10 Mathern opposes this request. Defendant notes that plaintiff has already served 23 interrogatories  
11 and that he provides no reason why the interrogatories already served are insufficient or why 25  
12 additional interrogatories are necessary. Plaintiff, in his most recent submission (Dkt. No. 64),  
13 explains that he has several more questions for defendant arising out of new evidence and  
14 information he has received. Plaintiff fails, however, to specify what the new evidence or  
15 information is or to explain why these new discoveries necessitate effectively doubling the number  
16 of interrogatories provided for in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court is not satisfied  
17 that the additional interrogatories are warranted. Accordingly, that portion of plaintiff's pending  
18 motions is denied.

19 (2) Plaintiff has submitted two recent letters to the Court requesting that he be  
20 provided copies of all complaints and all evidence submitted to the Court in this action and in  
21 cause number C08-328-RSL-JPD. Plaintiff is advised that although he has been granted leave to  
22 proceed with this action *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), his IFP status does not entitle him to copies

01 of documents at Court expense. Documents submitted to the Court for filing become the property  
02 of the Court and it is plaintiff's responsibility to keep copies of all such submissions for his own  
03 records. Accordingly, plaintiff's requests for copies (Dkt. Nos. 57 and 62) are DENIED.

04 (3) Plaintiff has submitted to the Court a request for defendant to schedule a telephone  
05 conference with him through his prison counselor. (Dkt. No. 63.) This document does not  
06 request any action be taken by the Court and is therefore STRICKEN from the Court's calendar.

07 (4) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for  
08 defendant, and to the Hon. Marsha J. Pechman.

09 DATED this 8th day of July, 2008.

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Mary Alice Theiler  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22